102 Rare 5
Introduction

A CASE

FOR

KARNATAKA UNIFICATION

(BEING THE INTRODUCTION TO A BOOK-LET CALLED
UNITED KARNATAKA)

1928

Edited by :—

THE SECRETARIES,
Karnatak Unification Sabha,
& K. Un. Sub-Committee of
The K. P. C. C.
DHARWAR

954.87
SEC

AKSHARA GRANTHALAYA
ACC.NO. 111493

INTRODUCTION

TO

United Karnataka

THE PURPOSE

This booklet goes into the world with the name 'United Karnātaka' or 'A Case for Karnātaka Unification'. It is a title sufficiently descriptive of the aim with which it is written. The main purpose of this humble attempt is to prove, that it is absolutely necessary to form British Karnātaka, if not the whole of it, into a separate administrative province immediately, and to attach to it politically all the states in the Kannaḍa area so far as it is possible to do so, making due allowance for the present treaty-relations of such states with the Government of India.

We have sought to achieve this purpose, by expressing our belief in the principle of linguistic provinces and proving that that is the only rational basis for the redistribution of provinces in India, by showing that the present dismembered parts of Karnātaka have a common past, a common language, the heritage of a rich culture, and a common desire to unite, by stating the disadvantages that accrue on account of its present disintegration, by refuting every objection urged against unification of the different

954.87
SEC

parts of Karnātaka, and by showing with the help of statistics and arguments that it is within the domain of practical politics to make Karnātaka a self-supporting separate province immediately. The book-let has been written, for consolidating and concentrating the public opinion of Karnātaka on this point by voicing our common aspiration in clear terms, for enlisting the sympathies of sister-provinces by showing how Karnātanka and India stand to lose if Karnātaka is kept as it is, and for convincing all concerned by proving the case for Karnātaka Unification clearly and definitely.

111493

A Constitution for India

But before we proceed to consider the question of the redistribution of provinces and the unification of Karnātaka, a word or two must be said about the future constitution of the whole of India, because Karnātaka aims more eagerly at cordial inter-provincial relations within the borders of India, and a dignified status for it outside in the comity of nations, than at the unification of its own parts. The question of a constitution for India is as old as the establishment of the British power here. The British government has, no doubt, made changes from time to time to suit its own conveniences, and till 1885 *i. e.*, the date of the birth of the Indian National Congress, non-official India may be said to have been altogether dumb about constitutions.

It is only since then, that many other political and semi-political organisations have sprung up and are trying to shape the political destinies of this country. Fortunately for India, public opinion has grown so strong today, that though the British government has been almost callous to it so long, a time has come when it will have to respond, if it wants to avoid a perpetual conflict between the rulers and the ruled, and if it aims at establishing peace and prosperity in the land.

We have today before us quite a heap of constitutions or materials for a constitution for India, right from the Montague-Chelmsford Report to the recent publication of the Sub-Committee of the All Parties Conference. As if in refutation of the groundless charge advanced by some critics, that Indians have no constructive schemes to suggest as regards a constitution for India, quite a number of eminent political thinkers in India have published such constitutions. Some of them are in the form of bills, others are only draft constitutions, still others are mere suggestions on important constitutional points. Most of the drafts are well-thought out and are the out-come of deep thought, real foresight, and an intimate sympathy with the inner throbbings of Indian aspirations. All the constitutions make very interesting reading indeed. But what concerns us most here is only what these constitu-

tions have to say as regards, (1) the status of India, (2) the system of government and inter-provincial relations, and (3) the redistribution of provinces.

Dominion Status: the minimum demand

It is quite sufficient for our limited purpose here to state that almost all constitutions written up to this time are heading towards what may be called 'full responsible government' or 'dominion status'. There is a party, a strong party too, in India that wants complete independence. But, for being able to work in union with other parties, it is willing to go along with others and co-operate with them in securing the dominion status. It would be instructive to quote here a sentence or two from a few able and well-known writers.

We may begin by quoting the words of the historic pronouncement of Mr. Montague in August 1917. He said that the policy of the British Government was, 'the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India.' The proclamation of 25-12-1919, by His Majesty King George V while speaking of the Act of 1919 said, that it pointed 'the way to full responsible government hereafter' and 'to the right of her (India's) people to direct her affairs and safeguard her interests'. The Independent Labour Party of England passed in 1927 a resolution drafted by

Mr. Fenner Brockway. It says.' 'We recognise the right of India to self-determination.....and ask the representatives of the Indian parties in the Legislative Assembly to submit a constitution for adoption.' Mrs. Beasant's Commonwealth of India Bill, Mr. A. Rangswami Iyengar's 'A draft Swarajya Consistution for India', Mr. C. Vijayaraghavachariar's 'Swarajya Constitution', the 'Swarajya constitution' by Mr. S. Sreeniwas Iyengar and another by Mr. Hosakappa Krishnarao, and similar attempts by Sir Shivaswami Iyer, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer, and Sir Abdur Rahim all point to the same thing, namely Dominion Status, whether they name it 'Confederation of India', 'Commonwealth of India' or something else. The Nehru Committee of the All Parties Conference in its report published on 15-8-1928 declares that, 'India shall have the same constitutional status, in the comity of nations known as the British Empire, as the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, and the Irish Free State, with a parliament having powers to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of India, and an executive responsible to that parliament and shall be styled and known as the Commonwealth of India.'

Towards Federal Democracy

After having seen what political thinkers have to say about the status of India, let us see what they

opine as regards the system of government and the provinces. The Motague-Chelmsford Report on the constitutional reforms already foreshadowed a clearly federal type of government when it said, 'Our conception of the eventual future of India is a sister-hood of states self-governing in all matters of purely local or provincial interests, in some cases corresponding to existing provinces, *in others perhaps modified in area according to the character and economic interests of their people.* Over these congeries of states would preside a Central government increasingly representative of and responsible to the people, dealing with matters both internal and external of common interest to the whole of India, acting as an arbiter in inter-state relations and representing the interests of all India on equal terms with the self-governing units of the British Empire'. As Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer says briefly, 'in this passage there is found the germ of all the leafage and fruitage of Indian politics, provincial autonomy, linguistic provinces, a strong central government, a federation of various political units—and the constitution of a commonwealth equal in status to the self-governing dominions'. Mr. Rangswami Iyengar postulates, 'full provincial autonomy with the maintenance of a strong national commonwealth government'. Mr S. Sreeniwas Iyengar says, 'that a federal democracy is the best

safeguard against the springing up of ambitious oligarchies commercial or militarist'. Mr. Hosakoppa Krishnarao says that, 'the provinces and states should be free and autonomous in the Confederation of India'. Sir Frederic Whyte clearly favours a federation of provinces. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer also is for the federal system. The recommendations of the Nehru Committee point to the same thing.

Redistribution on linguistic basis

Thus after the consideration of the status of India and the system of government to be adopted, we come to the redistribution of provinces and that on a linguistic basis.

The present provincial division in India is admitted on all hands to be haphazard, unsystematic, artificial, and inconvenient. It does not follow any geographical, racial, or linguistic principle, nor has it been proved to be administratively convenient or successful. Every one knows that the political geography of India today is the result of historical causes. A leading Anglo-Indian journal, the Times of India, in its leading article 4–7–27. admitted that 'the present provincial boundaries are largely mere accidents of history'. There is no organic principle and no magnetic common bond that can bind the varied people of many of the existing provinces. Most of the writers thesefore propose

that there ought to be a redistribution of provinces and that mainly according to the linguistic basis. Let us see what some of them have to say.

There is no greater advocate of linguistic provinces than Mr. Lionel Curtis who wrote before the Reforms scheme of 1919. While speaking of the present provinces (in his Letter VIII entitled 'Map of India') says, 'They are for the most part the artificial creations of a paternal and highly centralised government which has its mainspring in England. They were designed as the satrapies of a vast oriental dependancy.....it is of vital importance to consider now what the proper provincial units are to be, out of which the whole of the national fabric can be built..... The internal peace of India, generations hence, will depend upon the wisdom and foresight with which the areas of provincial Self-Government are planned in the initial stages of the new departure.' While speaking of Bihar and Orissa he says, 'the defect of the present areas is that they are too mechanical. The province of Bihar and Orissa, for instance, combines communities with an almost cynical disregard of the differences between them. The plan suggested will remedy these unnatural unions, This particular province would fall naturally into three provincial states– Bihar with its population of 240 lacs, and Orissa and Chotanagpur with 50 lacs a piece. But Orissa itself ought

to be increased by the inclusion of those people of the same language and race who inhabit the northern extremity of Madras and the C. Provinces.'

Next when writing about the principle of redistribution he says, 'where possible, historic areas like Sind should be taken. *But units of language, race and religion are also important factors, and language is the most important of all.* The greatest obstacle to a real extension of popular government in India is the practice of conducting public business in the English tongue.....The use of the vernaculars in politics is essential if India is to advance towards responsible government, at any but the slowest pace. The areas of provincial governments must be designed largely, with a view to making it possible for public business to be discussed in a language, which all the legislators can speak with ease, and which the largest number of electors can understand..... The hope of popular government lies in its vernaculars.'

While speaking of the application of the principle he further says, 'If this experience is held in mind, can we really look forward to a United States of India within the British Common-Wealth, under which Sind and the Kanarese-speaking people are tied and bound into the same self-governing unit as the Marathas? Are not the Marathas themselves entitled to a state such as will perpetuate the tradi-

tions of that famous community? Are the Tamil and Telgu peoples of Madras to be given no separate institutions of their own ? Are the Oriyas to be left dispersed amongst three provinces, the larger section being left under the permanent domination of the people of Bihar ? To base responsible government on such units is not only to ignore the experience of the other dominions, but to violate the principles for which we are fighting in this war. You cannot base responsible government on units evolved on principles which are the antithesis of that system. You cannot graft figs on thorns or grapes on thistles.'

Now let us see what the Mont-Ford report itself says as regards this matter. The famous Report on Constitutional Reforms in its para 246, says that, 'we are impressed with the artificial and often inconvenient character of existing administrative units. We have seen how historical reasons brought them about. We cannot doubt that the business of Government would be simplified if administrative units were both smaller and more homogeneous; and when we bear in mind the prospect of the immense burdens of government in India being transfered to comparatively inexperienced hands, such considerations acquire additional weight. It is also a strong argument in favour of linguistic or racial units of government that, by making it possible to conduct the business of legis-

lation in the vernacular, they would contribute to draw into the arena of public affairs men who were not acquainted with English. We believe emphatically that redistribution of provincial areas cannot be imposed upon the people by official action and such a process ought in any case to follow, and neither to precede nor accompany, constitutional reform. But we are bound to indicate our clear opinion that wherever such distributions are neces. sary and can be effected by process of consent, the attempt to do so should be made; and therefore we desire that it should be recognised as one of the earliest duties incumbent upon all the reformed provincial governments to test provincial opinion upon schemes directed to this end. In Orissa and Behar at all events, it seems to us that the possibility of instituting sub-provinces need not be excluded from consideration at a very early date.'

In accordance with the principles laid down in these reccommendations, authority was given to the Viceroy in the Government of India Act 1919, section 52 A, to form new provinces, if the people of a particular area so wished. The Congress at Nagpur in 1920 was wise enough in regrouping provinces on a linguistic basis. Coming to more recent times, most of the writers on Indian constition have realised the importance of linguistic areas

and it will be interesting to see what some of them say. Mr. C. Vijayaraghavachariar makes provision for redistribution in his constitution, chapter VIII, and says, that a commission should be appointed to constitute provinces, regard being had to adminis trative conveniences and to the local sentiment that provinces should be formed on a linguistic basis. Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar in the preamble to his constitution says, that provision must be made for the redistribution of the boundaries of existing provinces, and in chapter XI again says, that the Indian Parliament ,as soon as may be, shall appoint a commission for the purpose of making proposals for reconstituting the provinces on the basis of language-groupings. Mr. S. Sreenivas Iyengar, who is a strong exponent of the cause says in the introduction to his constitution, that 'a rearrangement of provinces.....is necessary as well in the interests of a decisive reduction of expenditure as in the interests of an accelerated democracy.....on the whole, the linguistic basis is the safest for the proper functioning of Indian democracies, and for the minimising of intercommunal friction. It is the natural solvent of religious and communal differences, and is amongst the most powerful of unifying agencies.' Under the heading 'New Provinces' he further lays down that provinces be constituted on the basis of language-grouping.

AKSHARA GRANTHALAYA
ACC.NO. 111493

But more important and weighty than the opinions of individuals belonging to different political groups is the opinion of the Nehru Committee published on the 15th of August 1928. It is a document which must command respect from every thinker in India and in England. The All Parties Conference consisting of representatives from no less than 34 political and semi-political organisations appointed a Sub-Committee of nine persons *viz*, Pandit Motilal (Chairman), Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Sir Ali Imam, Syt. Prdhan, Syt. Shuaib Qureshi, Syt. Subhash Chandra Bose, Syt. Madhavarao Aney, Syt. M. R. Jayakar (who resigned on account of ill-health), Syt. N. M. Joshi, and Sadar Mangal Singh, on May 19, 1928. After consultations with eminent Indian leaders such as, Dr Ansari, Pandit Malaviya, Moulana Abdul Kalam Azad, Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, Dr. Kitchlew and others, and after about 25 sittings they have been able to put before the public this unanimous report.

111493

Nehru Committee and redistribution

While speaking alout the redistribution of provinces they say that, 'every one knows that the present distribution of provinces in India has no rational basis. It is merely due to accident and the circumstances attending the growth of the British power in India. As a whole, it has little to do with geographical or historical or economic or linguistic

reasons. Even from the purely administrative point of view, it is not a success. It is clear that there must be a redistribution of provinces..... What principles should govern this re-distribution ? Partly geographical and partly economic and financial, but the main considerations must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned. It is well-recognised that rapid progress in education as well as in general culture and in most departments of life depends on language. If a foreign language is the medium of instruction, business, and affairs, the life of the country must necessarily be stunted. No democracy can exist where a foreign language is used for these purposes .....If a province has to educate itself and do its daily work through the medium of its own language, it must necessarily be a linguistic area..... Hence it becomes most desirable for provinces to be regrouped on a linguistic basis. Language as a rule corresponds with a special variety of culture, of traditions, and of literature.....The National Congress recognised this linguistic principle 8 years ago and since then, so for as the Congress machinery is concerned, India has been divided into linguistic provinces.'

Again when thinking of giving practical effect to the linguistic principle they say, ' Another principle which must govern a redistribution of provinces

is the wishes of the people concerned. We who talk of self-determination on a larger scale cannot in reason deny it to a smaller area, provided of course, this does not conflict with any other important principle or vital question.....Thus we see that the two most important considerations in rearranging provinces are the linguistic principle and the wishes of the majority of the people. A third consideration, though not of the same importance, is administrative convenience, which would include the geographical position, the economic resources, and the financial stability of the area concerned.'

Nehru Committee and Karnataka

Then coming to Karnātaka, whose case they were kind enough to study in detail, they say, 'The case for the Karnātaka was placed before us by a representative of the Karnātaka Unification Sangh and the Karnātaka Provincial Congress Committee. It had been ably prepared with a wealth of information, historical, cultural, and statistical. All our questions were answered satisfactorily and in our opinion a strong *prima facie* case for unification and the formation of Karnātaka as a separate province was made.....Parts of the Karnātaka lie in Indian States, notably Mysore, and there are obvious practical diffiiculties in the way of uniting these with the rest. It might also not be convenient to unite the small islands of the Karnātaka on the other

side of Mysore territory as these would be cut off from the Karnātaka proper by Mysore. But even so a sufficiently large area remains..... Financially the position of the Karnātaka was very strong and even at present there was a considerable surplus in the British part of the Karnātaka.' Finally they recommended that, ' parts of Karnātaka, except the small islands on the other side of the Mysore territory, should be separated from the provinces in which they are at present included and formed into a single separate province.'

Conditions for redistribution

Now, if we review all that we have written so long, we clearly see that a dominion status for India in the comity of nations, a federal system of government or a federal democracy as Syt. Sreenivas Iyengar suggestively calls it, and a redistribution of provinces on linguistic basis, are the marked and common features of them all. We are not called upon to express our opinion here as regards the first two features, but we fully agree with the last principle, namely that as regards linguistic provinces, and we shall deal with it alone and apply it to the province Karnātaka. However, before stating the case for Karnātaka unification, we must see what circumstances are necessary for a revision of the boundries of a province. Though most have agreed generally to a redistribution of provinces on

linguistic lines, very few seem to have gone deeper and laid down clearly the conditions that ought to be present before any such redistribution is granted. Let us make an attempt to state some of the most necessary conditions.

We think that the very first condition is, that the people who demand such a revision of boundaries must have a distinct cultured language with a past and a future, together with a strong language or race-consciousness, which has not died inspite of adverse circumstances and which is sure to persist in the future. The next thing is that such a people should have real grievances under the present arrangements. The grievances are certainly likely to be keener if the people are scattered in more than one province. The grievances may be either in the form of lack of scope and opportunity for the people of the same language or race living under different adminstrations to come together for fostering their language and traditions, for developing their resources, for manifesting their special race-characteristics, or in the form of a dominnance of the majority linguists in the province in which the former are in the minority. The grievance might he said to be specially keen when the minority is a helpless and a hopeless minority, and has absolutely no chances of showing itself at its best, either on account of its being treated unsympathetically by the

majority or when it is comparitively more backward than the majority or when the majority has certain strong prejudices against it. In short, if the present boundaries are a real handicap on the development of a certain linguistic group and if the redistribution is likely to help them to come out with the best they have as an offering at the feet of Mother Ind, then there can be said to be a real grievance which ought to be removed both in the interest of the particular group and in the wider interests of the nation.

When a distinct literary language as aforesaid exists, when there is a strong linguistic or racial consciousness accompanying it, and when the people speaking that language have a real grievance, then the next thing necessary is a genuine demand for a redistribution on the linguistic basis. The demand should come from at least a two-thirds majority and the case is very strong if it is practically unanimous. Even when all these conditions are fulfilled there are what are called practical considerations and they are as important as any that we have so long treated.

The proposed unification or separation must be a practical proposition, that is the size and population of the proposed province should not be ridiculously small, the area should be contiguous as far as possible and above all the new province should be in a position to support itself and be willing to bear the burden of fresh taxation if necessary.

The Reason of it

We hope that every one would easily appreciate the reason of the conditions laid above, which must be ful-filled before the revision of any provincial boundary is taken in hand. If these conditions are not laid down there would be no end to language-groupings in India, as according to scholars, there are no less than 252 languages in India. The language principle would, in the absence of the above conditions be as ridiculous as the communal principle itself. No people who speak dialects or sub-languages and no people who have no strong and irrepressible language-consciousness can or should really claim separation or unification. Unless there is such a consciousness there is no danger of such a group being permanently dissatisfied and disaffected which is like a chronic disease to a body politic. People speaking dialects and sub-languages, should in the interest of the nation, foster a love for their mother language and try to develop it rather than their own dialect. If a language-group is sufficiently big in a province and can develop without any handicap, it need not specially try for regrouping unless it has its fellow-linguists in the neighbouring provinces or unless it has some special grievance. And then there is no meaning in a few people belonging to a language-group asking for a separate province. The demand should be a formidable one. Then comes the

practical view of things. Unless an area and its population is capable of and willng to shoulder the responsibilities of a modern state, there is no meaning in a demand for a separate province. Above all the fresh province should not be in the plight of a son that demands separation from his father, but has to take up immediately the begging bowl for his very maintenance.

Does Karnataka fulfill conditions?

In view of the above observations let us examine the case of Karnāṭaka. If we take the present-day Karnāṭaka, meaning thereby the whole tract occupied by Kannada speaking people (they number 10, 374, 204 in the whole of India), it is distributed mainly among five administrations, namely, the Bombay and Madras presidencies, the province of Coorg, the states of Mysore and Hyderabad (Dn). Then there are the smaller states of Kolhapur, Sangli, Miraj, and Aundh which claim very small portions of Karnāṭaka, while Jamkhindi, Mudhol, Ramdurg, Savanur, Jath, Akkalkot, Kurundwad, Sondur, Daflapur etc. lie wholly or mostly within its boundaries. Since we are considering the problem of the states here as subject to the treaty relations of those states with the government of India, let us only be satisfied with saying, that they should be attached to the future province of Karnāṭaka so for as those relations allow them to be so attached. Let

us examine more closely the position of British Karnātaka.

We see that British Karnātaka is divided among these administrations: the Bombay presidency has the 4 districts of Belgaum, Dharwar, Bijapur and Karwar together with the taluka of Sholapur and about 50 villages of the district of Satara; the Madras presidency has the 3 districts of Mangalore, Bellary, and Nilgiris, the talukas of Madagsira (dist. Anantpur), Kollegal (dist. Coimbatore), Hosur and Krishnagiri (dist. Salem), and the small province of Coorg. Let us see if this British Karnātaka satisfies the conditions laid down by us for regrouping the provinces on language-basis.

It is impossible within the short space at our command in this Introduction to state in detail the claim of Karnātaka for a separate province. For that, we will have to refer the readers to the book itself. We shall have to be satisfied here with a brief summary of the case.

Karnataka needs and deserves unification

Let us take the conditions we have laid down one by one. None can deny that the Kannada language, which belongs to the Dravidian stock and is spoken by 10,374,204 (1921 census) people, which has a rich literature at least as old as the 9th century when king Nripatunga (814–870 A. D.) wrote his famous

Kavirajamarga on poetics, which can boast of a thousand poets whose varied works are today either available or mentioned, which today publishes 100 different journals, is a distinct language with a high pedigree and a great future. We can with equal emphasis say that Karnātaka has a common past history going back at least to the 2nd century A. D. The oldest Kannada inscription is dated 199 A. D. (vide Mythic Society's Journal, May, 1928). The Gangas of Talkad (Mysore) ruled from the 3rd to the 11th century A. D. in Gangawadi. Then we have a long line of dynasties chief among whom may be mentioned, the Kadambas of Banavasi in N. Canara (250–550 A. D.), the Chalukyas of Badami in Bijapur (550–750 A. D.), the Rashtrakutas of Malkhed in Nizam's dominions (753–997 A. D.), the western Chalukyas of Kalyan in the Nizam's dominions (973–1190 A. D.) the Hoysalas of Dorasamudra in Mysore (1147–1310 A. D.), the famous Sangama, Tulu, and other dynasties of Vijayanagar in Bellary (1336–1565 A. D.), and the Odeyars of Mysore (1400–1928 A. D. with two breaks.) Among others may be recorded the Yadavas, the Keladi, Haleri, and Nilgiri Nayaks, and the Rattas. The whole epigraphical wealth of Karnātaka consisting of at least 10000 undeciphered inscriptions are yet to give us all details. But it is now clear that some of the most eniment of the

Karnātaka kings, like Satyashraya Pulkeshi, Vikramankadeva, Nripatiunga, Bittideva, Krishna, Krishna devaraya and others ruled over most of the country now known as Karnātaka and much more.

The culture of Karnātaka is also something of which any one would be justly proud. Of the three great architectonic builders of the Vedantic systems Madhwā was born in Udipi, Ramanuja prospered in Dorasamudra, and Shankara established his greatest portifical seat in Shringeri. Basava the reformer, Vidyaranya theVedic scholar and saint-politician, the bhaktas Purandar and Kanaka, are all names to conjure with There is also an inspiring and ennobling litarature, there is the architecture and sculpture of Belur, Halebaid, Vithalswami temple, of Shravanabelgola and Karkal and of Boligumaj. Then Karnātaka can boast of a distinct system of music known throughout India as the Karnātaki system.

Next we have to see if the Karnātaka people have a strong language or race-consciousness today. The history of the unification movement provides ample evidence of such a growing consciousness. The movement started earlier than 1880, apparently for the advance of Kanarese literature ; but now it has developed into an All-Karnātaka agitation supported by every organisation and every journal in the province. The people have been more active since 1918 when they sent mamorials to Mr. Montague

demanding unification. 800 delegates attended the Nagpur Congress in 1920 when Karnātaka was given a separate Congress Circle. In 1921 they tried hard and reclaimed Bellary which had been claimed by the Andhras. In 1925, they fought hard against the inclusion of Bellary in the Andhra University jurisdiction. In 1928, they sent a representative to the Nehru Committee for demanding Unification. Thus the people of Karnātak have an irrepressible language-consciousness which is growing in volume and intensity everyday.

Grievances of Karnataka

Now let us see if there are any real grievances from which the Kannada people are suffering. There is no doubt that they have such grievances. This province which was homogeneous for more than a thousand years has been now split up. Its people are in the hopeless minority of 19 and 6 percent respectively, in the Bombay and Madras presidencies, and the Kanarese districts form tail-ends in both the administrations. They are furthest from the capital towns. Communications and education have been grievously neglected and but for missionary effort S. Canara would have been as backward in education as N. Canara and both as backward as other parts of Karnātaka. For a High court and for a University Karnātakas have to run to Bombay and Madras where their language has but scant

respect. There is hardly one man to represent Kannada in the Senate of the Bombay University. No such things can be said of Coorg but it suffers, by being too small, from the predominance of European planters, and from a system of government which is antediluvian. Karnātaka has been clamouring for a port at Bhatkal in order to have an outlet to the sea for the development of her commerce, but the demand goes unheeded like many such demands of Karnātaka. Karnātaka contributes about 48 lacs of rupees in excess of what is spent on her and yet irrigation and agricultural improvement are at a discount here. The majority languages are encroaching on Kannada and during the last census-decade she has lost about 2 lacs. Thus the present divisions are a real handicap to the natural development of the language, the arts, and industries of the people of Karnātaka.

There is also other evidence which clearly proves that Karnātaka feels the need for unification. Bombay and Madras Karnātakas are drawn to each other by language though they are divided by administrative interests. But inspite of all this, they are trying hard to come together by calling All-Karnatāka conferences. The present disintegration alone seems to stand in the way of progress. Since the Congress gave Karnātaka a separate circle in 1920, a number of All-Karnātaka conferences have been held. In May 1928, the 5th Political Conference,

the 4th Bhagini-mandal conference, the 3rd Karnātaka Unification Conference, the 2nd Hindi conference, the 1st Khadi Conference were held in Dharwar; in July, the 3rd Ayurveda Conference met in Mangalore; in August, the 3rd Karnātaka Seva Dal Conference, the 1st Merchants' conference, the 1st Journalists' conference, the 3rd Gorakshana Conference, were convened. In June, the 14th Sahitya Sammelana held its sessions in Gulburga. All these efforts point to the conclusion, that Karnātaka is alive to the dis-advantages of its dismemberment and is trying its best to organise its activities on the language-basis.

A unanimous demand

Karnātaka has long since hit upon the root-cause of all its ills and has been trying to remove it from the year 1917, when the Karnātaka Sabha was first started. The demand for Karnātaka unification has been unanimous. Every newspaper in Karnātaka including those in the states stand for it and advocate it. The 6 All-Karnātaka political conferences, held since 1920, and the 3 Karnātaka Unification conferences since 1924, have passed unification resolutions unanimously. Besides these, the Veerashaiva Mahasabha held in Bangalore in December 1927, the Merchants conference held in August last in Bagalkot, have demanded unification. The Local Boards of all the Bombay Karnātaka districts, and of Mangalore, many Taluka Local Boards

as well as a number of municipalities have passed such resolutions and sent them to the Government. A general manifesto signed by 34 leaders of Karnātaka representing all districts, all castes, creeds, interests, and all political opinions, was issued in 1927 to the public, asking them to sign a declaration to the effect that they desired unification. A questionaire issued to about 200 gentlemen in Karnātaka brought in 125 replies, only one being against unification. Thus whatever the other differences, the unanimity of Hindus and Mussalmans, the Brahmins and the Non-Brahmins, the non-co-operators and the loyalists of Karnātaka, in demanding unification is, it can be said, almost embarrassing.

A practical proposition

After these preliminaries. we come to the practical view of things. Though Karnātaka is an area linguistically very alive, and though it demands unification with one voice in order to remove its own grievances, is it a sufficiently big area, has it a sufficiently big population, is its territory contiguous, is it likely to be a convenient unit of administration, and above all, is it financially self-supporting? We can with confidence reply in the positive to all these questions. We demand to-day the unification of the 8 districts of Belgaum, Dharwar, Bijapur, Karwar, Mangalore, Bellary, Coorg, and Nilgiri and the five outlying talukas of Kollegal,

Hosur, Krishnagiri, Madagsira, and Sholapur. Their total area is 35,408 sq. miles and population is 63,57,762. With this area and population they can make a bid for independence, much more reasonably can they claim a separate province. We draw the attention of the readers here to Apps. A. B. and C. Except the district of Nilgiri and the four talukas Kollegal, Hosur, Krishnagiri and Madagsira, the whole territory is contiguous, (vide map); and even that district and those talukas can be approached through Kannada territory namely, Mysore.

Aspecial word must be put in as regards the contiguity of the portions of British Karnatak. No doubt, the talukas of Kollegal, Hosur, Krishnagiri, and Madagsira in Appendix A and the district of Nilgiri are not strictly contiguous to other parts. But really speaking it is a continuous Karnataka province. While passing either from South Canara or from the southern end of the Dharwar district or from Coorg to the above-named parts, we have to traverse parts of Mysore. But Mysore, except in administrative matters, is fully Karnātaka in language, history, culture, and sympathies. So including them in the future province of Karnātaka is at the worst, inconvenenient and a little more expensive than if they were contiguous. But even today small states like Sangali, Jamakhandi etc. are administering certain of their portions which

are far-flung and Bombay itself is administering Sind across the many intervening states. So we are willing and ready even at a great inconvenience and some cost to have our distant brothers in language and culture, within the fold of the Karnātaka Province.

There is no question about the other parts as they are actually contiguous and the greatest distance from one end to the other will not be more than 400 miles. So the future province of Karnātaka will be a compact body, and very convenient for administration in contrast with the leviathan-like huge longish block of the Bombay presidency stretching from Sind to Karwar.

The last but the most important point is about finances. Can Karnātaka support itself? By all means. Let us study Apps. D. E. and F. Even leaving aside the income of the outlying talukas, D gives us a clear surplus of Rs. 48 lacs per year. Now if we run a Government of our own, we may at the most require what Bombay at present requires, namely 33 lacs for the provincial establishment. Add to it a sum of 12 lacs to be spent on jails and justice and still 45 lacs would be the utmost required. Assam manages with 260 lacs per year. Karnātaka with 250 lacs can as well do it. And there are great possibilities of development for Karnātaka. A coast-line railway, a port at Bhatkal,

the use of Gersoppa and other falls for producing electricity, a better irrigation system are all sure to increase the revenues of Karnātaka in the immediate future.

So Karnātaka satisfies every condition almost in every detail, and if any people today need unification most, and deserve a separate province immediately, it is the Karnātaka people.

Objections answered

After answering some of the objections against redistribution on linguistic basis and after a final appeal to all for supporting the cause of Karnātaka unification, we mean to close this small brochure.

There are fortunately none so senseless in India as to oppose redistribution altogether. Objections are however raised against redistribution on linguistic basis in general, and against Karnātaka unification in particular. Though most objections have been indirectly answered by the constructive side of our case for K. Unification, we shall examine briefly what our opponents have to say. We have come across only two main objections against a linguistic basis in redistributing provinces. The one is that language is not so binding a chord nor so permanent a characteristic. We have to say in reply that whether a language-bond is sufficiently strong or attractive depends upon the love that a particular

people cherish for their language. The history of Ireland and Italy, of Alsace-Lorraine and Bengal shows that the bond of language is as strong as that of adamant.

The other objection is, that it promotes too much provincialism. But provincialism is not an evil attendant only upon linguistic provinces. Provincialism and parochialism are evils which must be fought by sound nationalism.

The objections urged against Karnātaka unification may be summed up as: (i) Karnātaka has no distinct culture, no racial unity, and no cultural affinity among its people; (ii) it has no common history and was never a single province; (iii) Kannada is not the only language in Karnātaka; (iv) Karnātaka has no disadvantages now; (v) it is too small in area and in population; (vi) it is not contiguous; (vii) it has the problem of states; (viii) it has no good communications, no capital towns, no great personalities, no port; and (ix) it cannot be self-supporting. Though the list seems to be a pretty long one, many of the objections are self-condemned and have been already answered. The first two objections are the result of ignorance about the people and their history. One who goes through 'United Karnātaka' will feel the force of this remark. Nobody has denied the fact (iii). There are other languages, but Kannada is the most predominant and is 75 per cent on an average. As to (iv)

the disadvantages have been already dealt with. (v) and (vi) These have been answered. (vii) It is no problem as what we demand immediately is the unification of British Karnātaka only. (viii) This is an example of an argument in a circle. It is exactly because we want to improve our communications, to build a port, to have better opportunities, and to show our best, that we are demanding a separate province. (ix) This has been refuted by Appendix D.

An Appeal

This is the case for Karnātaka unification. Let facts, figures, and arguments speak more than mere sentiments. The Congress has already given a separate circle in 1920. The Nehru Committee has upheld the cause though it has wrongly withheld the so-called 'islands'. Now we appeal in the name of Karnātaka and India, to the people of Karnātaka to consolidate their strength, to the people of other provinces to sympathise with our aspirations, to the leaders of all provinces and parties to make this cause their own and fight to the finish, and see that Karnātaka comes to its own and plays its legitimate part in serving Bharat Mata.

NOTE

Unanimity of Demand

The following is the list of public men in the Karnātaka who signed the manifesto referred to on page xxvii. They represent all castes, creeds, interests and all shades of political opinion.

(1) Sjt. P. R Chikodi, B. A., Belgaum M. L. C. Bom.
(2) ,, Rao Bahadur S. T. Kambli, B. A., LL B., Dharwar M L. C. (Bom.) Ex-President (1924–26) K. Un. Sabha. Now (1926–29) Deputy President, Bombayt, L. C.
(3) ,, V. N. Jog, LL. B.. Dharwar, M. L. C., (Bom.)
(4) ,, A. Rangnath Mudliar, B. A., Bellary, M L. C. (Madras) Ex-minister (1926–28).
(5) ,, D. V. Belvi, B. A., LL. B., Belgaum, M. L. A.
(6) ,, C. C. Hulkoti, B. A., LL. B , Dharwar, President D. L. Board, and Dharwar Municipality.
(7) ,, A. F. I. Pathan, Pleader, Ex-President, Dharwar Municipality.
(8) ,, Rao Bahadur B. L Patil, B. A., LL. B , Ex-President (1926) Dharwar Municipality.
(9) ,, S. V. Kowjalgi, B A., LL. B., President, Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee.
(10) ,, Karnad Sadashivarao, LL B., Mangalore.
(11) ,, B. Bhimarao, B. A., B. L., Bellary.
(12) ,, Sardar Mahabub Allikhan, Hubli Ex-M.L A. (1923–26), M. L. C , Bombay.
(13) ,, Rao Saheb P. G. Halkatti, B. A , LL B., President (1928) K. Unification Sangha.
(14) ,, Rao Saheb Channabasappa Shirahatti, Hubli.

(15) „ Hardekar Manjappa, Kulapati, Veershaiva Vidyalaya, Almatti (Dist. Bijapur).

(16) „ Shankargouda Patil, B. A. LL. B., President (1926-28), D. L. Board, Bijapur.

(17) „ Narayanrao Joshi, B. A. LL. B. Belgaum.

(18) „ Hanmantarao Savanur, L. M. & S., Belgaum.

(19) „ A. P. Chougule. B. A. LL. B., Belgaum.

(20) „ Rao Bahadur Artal Rudragoda, I. S. O.

(21) Rao Bahadur S. N. Angadi, B. A. LL. B. Belgaum M. L. C. (Bom.), President (1927-28)D. L. B.

(22) Sjt. P. T. Kushalappa, M L. C. (Coorg).

(23) „ C. N. Venkappayya, B. A. B. L. Mercara, M. L. C. (Coorg).

(24) „ M. D. Karki, LL. B., Karwar, M.L.C. (Bom).

(25) Rao Saheb B. M. Basarur, Land Lord, N. Canara.

(26) Sjt. S. M. Kalayanapurkar, LL. B., N. Canara.

(27) „ Sangappa Desai, Rakkasagi, Bijapur, M. L. C. (Bom).

(28) „ M. G. Gopi, President, D L. B., N. Canara.

(29) Dr. Y. G Nadgir, M. S. Syndic. (Bom. Uni).

(30) Sjt. J. A. Saldhana, Mangalore, M. L. C.(Madras).

(31) „ A. B. Shetti, Mangalore, M. L. C , (Madras).

(32 „ K R. Karnath. B. A. B. L , Mangalore, M L.C. (Mad).

(33) „ Dr. U. Ramrao, Udipi, Member of the Council of State.

(34) „ Gangadharrao Deshpande. Land Lord, Rec. Com. Chairman, Belgaum Congress.

APPENDIX A

Area and population of the future Karnataka

(As per Census reports of 1921.)

8 DISTRICTS

Name of District.	Area in sq. miles.	No. of Towns.	No. of Villages.	Total population.
1. Belgaum ...	4611	7	1062	952,996
2. Bijapur ...	5707	8	1120	796,876
3. Dharwar ...	4606	17	1260	1,036,924
4. North Kanara ...	3946	7	1257	401,727
5. South Kanara ...	4021	7	798	1,247,368
6. Bellary ...	5713	10	911	862,370
7. Coorg (Kodagu)...	1582	2	377	163,838
8. Nilgiris ...	982	3	54	126,519
8. Districts.	**31168**	**61**	**6839**	**5,588,618**
5 OUTLYING TALUKAS				
1. Madagsira .. *Dist. Anantpnr*	443	1	57	85,595
2. Hosur ... *Dist. Salem*	1217	1	437	186,430
3. Krishnagiri ... *Dist. Salem*	656	2	183	167,302
4. Kollegal ... *Dist. Coimbatore*	1076	1	84	95,356
5. Sholapur ... *Dist. Solapur*	848	1	150	234,461
5. Talukas.	**4240**	**6**	**911**	**769,144**
Grand Total ...	**35408**	**67**	**7750**	**6,357,762**

APPENDX B

Area, Population, and Finances of Karnataka compared

A comparitive table of the proposed Karnataka province and some other provinces and states in India which are already separate administrative units or claim to be separate.

No.	Name of existing or would-be provinces and states	Area in Sq. miles	Papulation	Income Rs.	Expenditure Rs.	Remarks.
1	**Karnataka** (for detals see App A.) ...	**35,408**	**63,57,762**	**257,99,383**	**209,19,367**	Income does not include that of the outlying Talukas and expenditure does not include that on provincial government.
2	Assam ...	52,959	75,98,861	259,12,000 (1925-26)	237,28,000 (1925-26)	This is already a separate province.
3	Sindh ...	47,066	32,78,493	...	...	Claims to be a separate province and the Nehru Committee has decided in its favour.
4	N. W. Frontier ...	16,466	22,47,696	...	...	A separate minor province though with a Chief Commissioner.
5	Orissa ...	89,000	15,25,0000	...	...	Claims to be a separate province.
6	Mysore State ...	29,444	59,76,660	355,91,000 (1928-29)	365,48,000 (1928-29)	Most efficient administration-
7	Coorg (minor province) ...	1,582	1,65,833	12,92,000	13,51,000	Uuder chief Commissioner.

Noto:—This table refutes a number of objections against Karnataka Unification. Assam which is only a little bigger than Karnataka is already a Governor's province with a Council. Mysore, though a State, is one of the best-governed and though smaller than the future Karnataka province in area and population, has developed its income from two crores in 1915 to 3·5 crores in 1928. A government which allowed Coorg to be a province cannot argue against the smallness of the area of any province.

APPENDIX C

Are aand population, of Karnataka compared (*contd*).

A comparitive table of the proposed Karnataka province and some dominions and independent countries which are about the same size or population as Karnataka.

No.	Name of province	Area	Population
1	**Karnataka** (For details See. App. A) ...	**35,408**	**63,57,762**
2	Nepal ...	54,000	56,00,000
3	Afganistan ...	245,000	63,80,500
4	Denmark ...	17,144	32,89.195
5	Ireland ...	32,586	43,90,219
6	Belgium ...	11,744	76,84,272
7	Australia	29,74,581	54,36,794

Note :—This table shows that Karnataka may not only claim to be a separate province but even claim independence

APPENDIX D

The Income and expenditure of the 8 districts of Karnataka

(As per Government replies to questions in legislative councils and from Administrative Reports.)

	INCOME			EXPENDITURE		
Name of districts.	Revenue from Central Head.	Revenue from Pro. head	Total revenue from central and Pro. heads.	Expenditure on Central heads.	Expenditure on Provincial heads	Total Expenditure on Central and Prov. heads
1. Belgaum ...	140,000	3,910,000	4,050,000	Not available	Not available	3,600,000
2. Bijapur ...	150,000	2,700,000	2 850,000	,,	,	2,090,000
3. Dharwar ...	220 000	4,980,000	5,200,000	,,	,	3,960,000
4. North Kanara ...	40,000	1,740,000	1,780,000	,,	,,	1,810,000
5. South Kanara ...	159,827	4,990,341	5,150,168	74,125	2,939,351	3,013,476
6. Bellary ...	197,126	3,848,693	4,045,819	91,500	3,169,538	3,261,038
7. Coorg ...	Not available	....	1,292,000	Not available	.....	1,351,000
8. Nilgiris ...	285 889	1,137,507	1,423,396	236,218	1,648,635	1,884,853
		TOTAL ...	25,791,383		TOTAL ...	20,970,367

Deducting the total expenditure of Rs. 20,970,367 from the total revenues of Rs. 25,791,383 we have a clear balance of **Rs. 4,821,116** available for running the Provincial Government with a very liberal expenditure on it.

APPENDIX E

Expenditure of the Bombay Presidency on Provincial administration.

Revised Estimate 1927–28.

No.	Item.	Expenditure.
1	Governer, Executive Councillors and Ministers ...	11,92,000
2	Lagislative Bodies ...	2,00,000
3	Secretariat, Head Quarters Establishment ...	19,02,000
4	Miscellaneous ...	33,000
		33,27,000

Note :— This table excludes two more civil departments namely, jails and justice. Even if we suppose that as big a sum is required for running the administration of Karnataka and an additional 12 lacs for justice and jails the total comes to 45,27,000 whereas appendix D shows a surplus of **Rs. 4,821,116** and therefore Karnataka is self-supporting financially and can run the most costly of administrations even today.

APPENDIX F

Revenue and Expenditure of Assam (Roughly equal to Karnataka) on General Administration.

Revenue.		Expenditure.	
Revised Estimate. **1926-1927.**	Actuals. **1925-26.**	Revised Estimate. **1926-27.**	Actuals **1925-26.**
258,04,000.	259,12,000.	259,87,000	237,28,000.

Karnàtaka with its income of **Rs. 25,791,383** can be as self-supporting as Assam.

PRINTED BY M. K. JOSHI AT THE KARNATAK
PRINTING WORKS DHARWAR

and

PUBLISHED BY M. R. KEMBHAVI AT THE
CONGRESS OFFICE, GADAG.